Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

02147 5 MAR 7 2003

No.

In The

Supreme Court of The United States

Michael Theodore Meyer,

Petitioner

v.

EUNICE DRELL; LASHLEY DRELL;
WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES;
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF
WYOMING,

Opponent(s)

On A Petition For A Writ of Certiorari
To The Federal District Court
For
The State of Wyoming

A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Michael Theodore Meyer
Pro Se
418 Meade Creek Road
Sheridan, Wyoming 82801
(I don't have a phone)

196 pp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Is is lawful for the State of Wyoming to remove a fundamental right without due process, i.e., demanded jury trial?

2. Is if lawful for the State of Wyoming to adopt a child out without first removing parental rights, if there is a non-consenting parent?

3. Is it lawful for the State of Wyoming to violate its own rules concerning judicial conduct, by allowing Justices to determine the outcomes of hearings in which they have a personal, vested interest?

4. Is it lawful for the State of Wyoming to violate it's own rules concerning the conduct of an attorney?

5. Is it lawful for the State of Wyoming to violate

its own Constitutional law, to desist from interfering with personal religious belief and practice?

6. Is it lawful for the State of Wyoming to determine a minor's religious belief against the wishes of the child, and against the wishes of the child's only living parent, who still retains parental rights?

LIST OF PARTIES INVOLVED WITH CORPORATE DISCLAIMER

1. Kelly Jo Ann Drell

2. Katherine Ann Drell (Deceased)

3. Michael Theodore Meyer, pro se

4. Eunice Drell

5. Lashley Drell (Deceased)

6. Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming.

    a. Allison Morrison

    b. Gerri Harris

    c. Mike Smith

    d. Mary Ellen Callahan

    e. Mary Ann Lee

    f. Caroline Yeaman

    g. Leilani McBee

h. Rob Landis

i. Joe Poliski

j. Bob Kuchera

k. Joe Nies

l. Rick Robb

m. Bob Quick

n. George Lavato

o. Shirley Carson

p. Jim Hammer

q. Kathy Steiger Dietz

r. William Tyrrell

s. Honor Mahoney

t. Kim Larson

u. Trish Warren

v. Juli Wallens

w. Jim Fudge

x. Tina Miller

y. Ed Heimer

z. Barbara Walseth

aa. Dave Shaad

bb. Sandy Rubotten

cc. Heather Babbitt

dd. Mrs. C. Gray, former Director of Wyoming Department of Family Services.

ee. Susan Lehman, present Director of Wyoming Department of Family Services.

7. Ross Clanton, Guardian ad Litem (deceased).

8. Hardy Tate, Attorney for Eunice and Lashley Drell.

9. Northern Wyoming Mental Health Center, Inc.

10. Pam Christensen, Therapist employed by Northern Wyoming Mental Health Center, Inc.

11. Mary I. Bowers, M.D., prescribing psychoactive drugs to KD.

12. Pam Emerson, CASA Director

13. Tara Kwolek, CASA Supervisor

14. Attorney General, State of Wyoming

15. Jim Geringer, former Gov., State of Wyoming.

16. Dave Friedenthal, present Gov. , State of Wyoming.

CORPORATE DISCLAIMER

THERE ARE NO OTHER CORPORATIONS, OR ANY OTHER PERSONS INVOLVED IN THIS DOCUMENT and NO MONIES HAVE BEEN CONTRIBUTED TO THIS CAUSE, TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questions Presented for Review	i
Parties Involved & Corporate Disclaimer	iii
Table of Contents	vii
Table of Authorities	ix
TEXT	
A Petition for A Writ of Certiorari	1
EXHIBITS	
Exhibit A - Final Decree of Adoption	A1
Exhibit B - Wyoming Supreme Court - Excerpts from Hearing Transcript	B1
Exhibit C - Fourth Judicial District - Motion & Order Dismissing Petition to Establish Child Support	C1
Exhibit D - Wyoming Supreme Court - Order Staying All District and	

Juvenile Court Proceedings D1

Exhibit E - Sheridan County Wyoming -

1. Public Official Bonds E1
2. Judicial Oath of Office E3
3. Wyoming Judicial Canon 4 E5

Orders & Motions

1. Certification of Transcript Request a1
2. Designation of Court Documents b1
3. Letter to Hon. William S. Downes c1
4. Order Dismissing Action d1
5. Notice of Appeal e1
6. Brief of the Appellant f1
7. Motion for Disclosure g1
8. Order & Judgment h1

Appendix

Civil Appearance Docket Entry List I-XXI

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
United States Law Concerned in this Document

1. 28 U.S.C. § 2101 (e)
2. 28 U.S.C. § 1343
3. 42 U.S.C. 1983

Wyoming State Constitution

1. Article 1
2. Article 1, Sections 002, 006, 007, 018, 036, 037
3. Article 3, Section 027
4. Article 5, Section 025
5. Article 21, Section 025

Wyoming Law

1. 14-2-309
2. 14-2-312
3. Rule 38 W. R. C. P.
4. W. S. 1-22-101 to 1-22-114
5. Wyoming Judicial Canons 1 through 5

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF WYOMING

MICHAEL THEODORE MEYER,	)
Petitioner,	) Case No.
	) 02
vs.	) CV-0046-D
	)
EUNICE DRELL, LASHLEY DRELL,	) FILED
STATE OF WYOMING,	) 15 MAR
DEPARTMENT	) 2002
OF FAMILY SERVICES	) DISTRICT
	) OF
and	) WYOMING
	) CHEYENNE
	)
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF	)
THE STATE OF WYOMING	)
Respondents.	)

A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Now comes Michael Theodore Meyer pro se before the United States District Court for the State of Wyoming in the matter of the adoption of KD.

I. JURISDICTION

1. This Court has civil rights jurisdiction under 28 U. S. C. § 2101 (e); 28 U. S. C. § 1343;

42 U. S. C. 1983; U. S. Constitution, 1st Amendment, 7th Amendment, 14th Amendment; Wyoming State Constitution, Article 1, Article 1 Section 002, Section 006, Article 1 Section 007, Article 1 Section 018, Article 1 Section 036, Article 1 Section 037, Article 3 Section 027, Article 5 Section 025, Article 21 Section 025; Wyoming Law 14-2-309, 14-2-312, Rule 38 W.R.C.P., Wyoming Law 1 -22-101 to 1-22-114.

II. QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Is it lawful for the State of Wyoming to remove a fundamental right without due process, i.e., demanded jury trial?

2. Is it lawful for the State of Wyoming to adopt a child out without first removing parental

rights, if there is a non-consenting parent?

3. Is it lawful for the State of Wyoming to violate its own rules concerning judicial conduct, by allowing Justices to determine the outcomes of hearings in which they have a personal, vested interest?

4. Is it lawful for the State of Wyoming to violate its own rules concerning the conduct of an attorney?

5. Is it lawful for the State of Wyoming to violate its own Constitutional law, to desist from interfering with personal religious belief and practice?

6. Is It lawful for the State of Wyoming to determine a minor's religious belief against the wishes of the child, and against the wishes of

the child's only living parent, who still retains parental rights?

III. NATURE OF THE CASE

1. This case involves the taking up of a child, KD, by the Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming, in May 1992,over the mother's arrest for public intoxication in Casper, Wyoming, a misdemeanor offense, and the refusal of the Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming to return same child KD, to either of her natural parents, even though, neither was charged with any sort of felony abuse or neglect of the child. The child, KD, was held from May 1992 up until February 2001, at which point she was adopted to Eunice and Lashley Drell, the latter being the

maternal grandfather, 72 years of age, a victim of multiple strokes, living in and out of a nursing home, virtually unable to conduct his life without constant assistance, and a life-long alcoholic, and Eunice Drell, his third wife, but of no blood or genetic relationship to the child, KD, who is an employee of the Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming.

2. Final Decree of Adoption was filed February 14, 2001. (Exhibit A, pages 2 through 6)

IV. FACTS

1. Michael Theodore Meyer is the biological and legally-declared father, by his own pro se efforts, in the Fourth Judicial District Court, State of Wyoming, filed October 6, 1994, Exhibit C - Order of Paternity, of the child, KD.

2. Michael Theodore Meyer has consistently kept contact with his child, KD, through all these years that she was held by the Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming, without missing so much as one opportunity to visit his child, without missing any opportunity to have contact with his child, KD, and even to the point, that after this adoption, the child, KD, contributes as much, or more, effort than Michael Theodore Meyer, to have contact with each other, which Mr. Meyer's efforts alone are considerable, even against the tide of contrary public policy, and possible violation of state ordinance, to the point of convincing all concerned that this contact is correct and the proper thing to do, i.e., against all odds.

3. Mr. Meyer has demanded and paid fees for, a jury trial concerning his parental rights, as provided by Wyoming Law 14-2-309, 14-2-312, Rule 38 W.R.C.P., LP v. Natrona County, Department of Public Assistance and Social Services., 679 P. 2d 976 (Wyo. 1984).

4. Mr. Meyer has never been charged with any offense of child abuse or neglect, or been proven unfit as a father in any Court in Wyoming or the United States. (See Exhibit D, - page 2, paragraph 4)

5. In and under Wyoming Laws 1-22-101 to 1-22-114, the complete Laws of Wyoming Adoption, mandated under Wyoming State Constitution, Article 3, Section 027, nowhere is it mentioned that these proceedings are for the removal of

parental rights. These laws are written under the color of parental rights already having been removed. The only place this is mentioned, of them being together, i.e., adoption and parental rights, is in Mr. Tate's, (attorney for the Drells), and Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming, Petition for Adoption. The State of Wyoming clearly has separate laws concerning both separate issues.

6. It is a fundamental right for a parent to have custody of their child - Wyoming State Constitution, Article 1, Sections 2, 6, 7, and 36. The state maintains that Mr. Meyer willfully abandoned his child, strictly over child support, but neglects the fact that the State determined, on March 8, 1999, that Mr. Meyer

owed no child support. (See Exhibit C - Order Dismissing Petition to Establish Child Support, Filed March 8, 1999). Judge David Park, during the adoption hearing, makes note of this unusual and surprising fact that there is no way to determine owed child support of which percentages must be paid or not paid to determine an adoption, under Wyoming Law, and Judge David Park and also the Supreme Court Justices make note that there is no way to compute an amount of child support owed or not owed. Mr. Meyer contends that he has paid fully 100%, as 100% of Zero (0) is Zero (0), a mathematical fact. In the matter of Voss' Adoption, 550 P.2d 481, 485 (Wyo. 1976), that the adopting petitioners must prove

abandonment AND failure to pay child support. Neither one alone is sufficient for an adoption. This is also stated and discussed numerously in Wyoming Statutes 1-22-101 through 1-22-114.

7. In the matter of DMR 982 P.2d 1246-48 (Wyo. 1999), abandonment must show purpose in abandonment, intentionally, knowingly, purposefully, voluntarily, conscientiously, deliberately, and without justifiable excuse, AND INTENT TO REMOVE PARENTAL TIES. Mr. Meyer has never missed an opportunity to see his child, KD, or have contact with his child KD, in his entire life, including during the mother's pregnancy, even if only by phone call, due to the distance of

physical separation. Mr. Meyer has spent nine (9), going on ten (10), years in litigation, never once without the goal of obtaining custody of his daughter. Admittedly fighting everyone concerned because he was told from the beginning, by employees of the Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming, i.e., Allison Morrison, Gerry Harris, Mary Ann Lee, Bob Kuchera, and Bill Tyrrell, all have said at one point or another that Mr. Meyer would never have custody of his child; and this been told him from the beginning. This has been documented through the years through two separate district courts, state of Wyoming, and to the Wyoming State Supreme Court, in the midst of volumous documentation, of which in

this last appeal consisted of five volumes out of the Fourth Judicial District Court, State of Wyoming, Adoption Hearing, alone. Mr. Meyer has refused to sign case plans over this one simple fact, not because of the words of one person from the Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming, but because of repeated statements by many persons of the Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming. (See Exhibit A, pages 5 and 6)

8. There are many instances of conflict of interest in this matter, and abuse of Judicial power. The first conflict of interest is that Eunice Drell ends up as the adoptive mother of the child KD, she is of no blood or genetic tie of the child KD, although she is an employee of the

Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming, and friend and associate of the other, above mentioned employees of the Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming. Lashley Drell, who suffered multiple strokes and is now virtually on his last legs due to congenital heart problems, and rarely has contact with the child, as he spends most of his time in and out of hospitals and nursing homes, is the only blood relative alive other than the father, Michael Theodore Meyer, involved in the adoption. Judge David Park is a friend and associate of David Drell, Mr. Meyer's brother-in-law, and a son of Lashley Drell, a former Natrona County, County Attorney. David Drell has attended all

hearings where Judge David Park has presided in this matter, but never attended when Judge Dan Spangler presided in this matter. Mr. Meyer has no documented proof of their friendship, but only through personal and family knowledge. (See Exhibit B - page 6)

9. Mr. Hardy Tate, is a Magistrate in the Fourth Judicial District Court, State of Wyoming, (See Exhibit E - Oath of Office, 13th day of July, 2000) and yet is serving as an attorney for the Drells in this matter. Wyoming State Constitution, Article 5, Section 025, strictly prohibits this condition. (See Exhibit E - Application of the Code of Judicial Conduct). In Exhibit A, Mr. Hardy Tate is touted as being a Court Commission and therefore allowed to

practice law in the same Judicial District Court. (See Exhibit A - pages 8, 9, and 10). Mr. Hardy Tate may well be a Court Commissioner; Mr. Meyer does not know. He may even be the jury, he may even be the cook and the captain bold, Mr. Meyer does not know. But Mr. Meyer does know that he is a Magistrate, and has paid Bond to be a Magistrate, as of August 21, 2001, in the Fourth Judicial District Court, State of Wyoming. (See Exhibit E - Office of the County Commissioners, Sheridan County Courthouse, document). This condition is strictly prohibited by Wyoming Law, for him to be a judge and practice law in the same court district. Although this is probably a common condition in Wyoming, it is still is

unlawful and cannot be justified. (See Exhibit B, page 6)

10. Judge John Brackley, who heard much of the hearings during the first part of this adoption, and all previous hearings concerning the child KD in the Fourth Judicial District Court, State of Wyoming (3 volumes), eventually recused himself, under pressure, due to his close ties to the Drells. (See Exhibit B, page 5).

11. Supreme Court Justice, State of Wyoming, William Hill, represented both the Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming and the Governor, Jim Geringer, State of Wyoming, against Mr. Meyer, during his tenure as the State of Wyoming Attorney General, and wrote many threatening letters to Mr. Meyer

during that time. (See Exhibit B, page 6)

12. Chief Supreme Court Justice Larry Lehman, State of Wyoming, wrote a Order Staying All District and Juvenile Court Proceedings, dated July 5, 2000, in which he was extremely favorable in his opinion towards Mr. Meyer. (See Exhibit D) After that occasion Chief Justice Lehman's wife, Susan Lehman, became Chief Director of the Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming. This was mentioned by Mr. Meyer as a 'possible conflict of interest' as Mr. Meyer's chief adversary is the Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming, and Mr. Meyer felt that this would be a deep and abiding conflict of interest in this matter. (See Exhibit B, pages 6 and 7)

13. In all but the first and second hearings, in 1993, concerning the child KD, in each one, Mr. Meyer's Judaic beliefs are brought up, questioned and refuted as being wrong, although these are being refuted as being wrong by persons of a non-Jewish faith, and the State of Wyoming Department of Family Services has stated repeatedly through the years that KD should be raised as a Christian, and not a Jew. (See Exhibit B, pages 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 14, and 22)

14. The Court cites several reported cases on adoption. To name a few, RHA 702 P.2d 1259 - in this matter the non-consenting father had already been convicted of incest with his daughter, and abuse, and therefore his

parental rights had already been terminated; in DWD 640 P.2d 73 (Wyo, 1980) support was determined in a divorce decree; in Basolow v Basolow, 907 P.2d 348-353 (Wyo, 1995), the father had abducted the child after a divorce, and did not contest custody to the wife; in Semler v Semler, 924 P.2d 422-424 (Wyo, 1996), everything was determined in a divorce decree beforehand; in Kennedy v Kennedy, 761 P.2d, 995-998 (Wyo, 1998), was also determined through divorce decree; in Blake v State, 933 P.2d, 474, 477 (Wyo, 1997), burden of proof is upon the appellant; in re: Adoption of Strawser, 65 (Wyo, 1998) 196 P.2d, 862, 866 (1948), the petitioner must proved abandonment.

15. THERE WAS NO DIVORCE, NOR HAS THERE EVER BEEN A DIVORCE DECREE LITIGATED IN THIS MARRIAGE, AS THE MARRIAGE ENDED THROUGH VEHICULAR HOMICIDE OF KATHERINE DRELL, THE MOTHER OF THE CHILD, KD. Since no divorce decree has ever existed in this matter, or ever will, then allegations of violating divorce decrees to support an adoption have no bearing on the issues of this matter. Since Mr. Meyer has never been charged with any abuse or neglect of his child KD, let alone incest, then therefore using common law concerning such a situation, where the parent already had had parental rights removed, also gives no support to this

adoption. And in fact, only the cases that present burden of proof upon the petitioners is the only statement that does have bearing upon this adoption. In the VOSS Adoption Reversal, the conditions purported of showing two points - abandonment AND lack of support - have even been, as shown to be totally unprovable, throughout these proceedings. (See Exhibit B)

IV. CONCLUSION

Mr. Meyer, therefore, submits that through all the actions mentioned above, a wrongful, erroneous, and tragic adoption has been perpetrated through the Courts of the State of Wyoming, through error of law; was grievously failed to be rectified by the Wyoming State Supreme Court due to the many, enormous and

personal conflicts of interest, and the prejudice against Mr. Meyer due to the mention of those conflicts of interest by Mr. Meyer, concerning Mr. Tate, Judge John Brackley, Judge David Park, Justice William Hill, Chief Justice Larry Lehman, and his wife Susan Lehman, Chief Director of the Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming.

Therefore, Mr. Meyer desires that this ADOPTION BE REVERSED and that the Respondents either charge Mr. Meyer with a crime worthy of REMOVAL OF PARENTAL RIGHTS, give Mr. Meyer A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL JURY TRIAL CONCERNING HIS PARENTAL RIGHTS, or if failure to find the evidence or ability to do that, RETURN KD, TO THE CUSTODY OF MR. MEYER, PHYSICALLY AND LEGALLY, ALONG WITH ALL

BAG AND BAGGAGE, AND ALLOW THEM TO LEAVE WYOMING.

Therefore, Mr. Meyer, respectfully submits this PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI to the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE STATE OF WYOMING.

Dated this day 15th day of March, 2002.

"s/Michael T. Meyer"
Michael Theodore Meyer, pro se
418 Meade Creek Road
Sheridan, Wyoming 82801

EXHIBIT A

IN THE DISTRICT COURT
OF THE FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
WITHIN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SHERIDAN,
STATE OF WYOMING

In the Matter of the Adoption OF KELLY JOANNE DRELL, A Minor Child	Certified Copy Adoption No. A7-3-00 Feb 14 2001 Doris Kobold Clerk of Court "s/Tempe Hall" Deputy

FINAL DECREE OF ADOPTION

This matter came for hearing before the Court on the 22nd day of January, 2001, to determine whether the Petition for Adoption without the consent of the natural father should be granted; the Petitioners, Lashley and Eunice Drell, being present and represented by their attorney, Hardy H. Tate; the non-consenting natural father, Michael Theodore

Meyer, being present and representing himself; and the minor child being present with her Court Appointed Guardian ad Litem, attorney Ross Clanton; and the Court having heard the testimony of witnesses and examined exhibits presented by the parties and having considered the petition and argument of the parties, finds generally that the Petitioners should be granted a Decree of Adoption.

The Court further specifically finds as follows:

1. With respect to Wyoming Statute 1-22-110(iv), that although the biological father, Michael Theodore Meyer, has not provided support and that he has an obligation of common law to provide support, and has willfully and woefully failed to meet this obligation without

any excuse, it has not been established how the biological father could become current with his support obligation within 60 days of the filing of the petition if a specific sum has not been alleged.

~~3.~~ 2. The Court further finds that the petition, with respect to Wyoming Statute 1-22-110(iv), is sufficient in that it fails to alert Mr. Meyer as to the consequences of failing to become current.

~~4.~~ 3. The Court does find, however, that the adoption may be granted pursuant to Wyoming Statute 1-22-110(v) for the reason that Mr. Meyer has willfully permitted the child to be maintained in or by the Department of Family Services

(DFS) for a period of one (1) year without substantially contributing to the support of the child.

~~2.~~ 4. The Court finds that although the Defendant has fought consistently almost since he became aware of the placement of the child with DFS, that does not mean he did not willfully allow the child to be kept by DFS.

~~3.~~ 5. The Court further finds that the Defendant became threatening with DFS members and their agents, threatening lawsuits against DFS, avoiding payment of his child support, generally refusing to acknowledge his obligations as a father.

~~5.~~ 6. The Court further finds that Mr. Meyer's actions were willful because he failed to provide a suitable home for his child, failed to provide any support or information by which support could be established, totally refused to cooperate with the establishment of a case plan, rejected endorsement of the case plan, and has not proposed any alternative plan or raised a legitimate objections to those plans.

~~6.~~ 7. The Court specifically finds that the father has acted generally contrary to the best interests of Kelly Drell and he as has created conflicts during visitation periods.

~~4.~~ 8. The Court finally finds that the best interests and welfare of the child will be served by granting the Petition to Adopt.

IT IS, THEREFORE, HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED by the Court that the Final Decree of Adoption be entered, that the above named minor child be declared to be the adopted daughter of Lashley Drell and Eunice Drell, and that all the rights, liabilities, privileges, and responsibilities of full parentage are hereby vested in the said Lashley Drell and Eunice Drell to the exclusion of all other persons whomsoever; and that the said Kelly JoAnne Drell is hereby given full rights of inheritance of the said adoptive parents and all other rights conferred by law of natural born

children.

DONE this 9th day of February, 2001.

"s/David Park"
District Judge

APPROVED AS TO FORM

Michael Theodore Meyer

"s/Hardy H. Tate"
Hardy H. Tate, Petitioner's Attorney

"s/Ross Clanton"
Ross Clanton, Guardian ad Litem

Duplicate of Clerk of the District Court. The above is a true and correct copy of the original instrument which is on file or of record in this court.
Done this 14 day of Feb 2001.
Doris Kobold - Clerk
by "s/Tempe Hall" - Deputy.

EXHIBIT B

Due to the printing needs of
THIS COURT
only relevant parts of this document are
printed here, but full pages of document
can be found in the original document
A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
presented to
THE TENTH FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE STATE OF WYOMING

COPY

IN THE SUPREME COURT, STATE OF WYOMING

In the Interest of

Kelly Drell, a minor

The Hearing in this matter was held on Thursday, October 18, 2001, before CHIEF JUSTICE LEHMAN, JUSTICE KITE, JUSTICE GOLDEN, JUSTICE HILL and JUSTICE VOIGT.

APPEARANCES:

For the Drells: HARDY H. TATE
Attorney At Law
Rocky Mountain Bank Building
203 South Main Street, Suite 3300
Sheridan, Wyoming 82801-4856

Pro Se: Michael Meyer
418 Meade Creek Road
Sheridan, Wyoming 82801

Meadors Court Reporting, LLC
140 W. Oak Street, Suite 226
Fort Collins, Colorado 80524

Phone: (970) 482-1506
Toll-Free (800) 482-1506
Fax: (970) 482-1230
e-mail: meadors@reporterworks.com

PROCEEDINGS

CHIEF JUSTICE LEHMAN: Mr. Meyer?

MR. MEYER: Thank you for hearing me, Your Honor.

As you know, I'm not an attorney and I'm a poor speaker.

CHIEF JUSTICE LEHMAN: We tried like heck to get

you some help.

MR. MEYER: Yes, sir, I understand.

I don't know what else I could add to the record.

You know, there's five volumes of record on this. Just on this case there's probably - - there's two other cases in 4th Judicial District Court that add to this and two volumes of stuff in the 7th Judicial spread out over a period of - - well, it's going into nine and a half years now. The only thing I can do is reiterate a few points I tried to make.

What crime did I commit that my daughter should be kept away from me? What crime did my daughter commit that she should be put through the so-called interests of the child that the Department of Family Services put he through?

Left her with foster parents that drove her around while drinking, abandoned her on Halloween in Casper on a street corner. She ended up being beat up and molested while in foster care, had a tooth broke out, has

had her arm broken, been chased around in her house, and

Lashley ran into a door where a window broke and cut her,

I mean a mirror.

I don't consider that interests of the child.

What did she do to deserve all that? I mean I don't know

what to say.

Lashley should have been looked into more

closely. His health is bad. He's living in a nursing

home. Why is he given adoption of my daughter? I don't

know that either. I'm a healthy man. I can raise

my

daughter and take care of her.

Eunice throws her in day care centers all the time when she was younger and puts her off on other people

and not raising her, and Lashley is unable to. He's had

three strokes now.

So I can't see why that would be any reason to

adopt her to them, instead of giving her back to me where

I can take her home and raise her.

The only thing that I can see - - the only crime I

can see that we committed is that we're Jews. It's

been

brought up in every hearing from the very beginning, my

Jewish belief. I took her to the Passover on - - in '93

when I first got to Wyoming to find her, and from then I

denied any religious holidays or even religious

teaching to her until recently.

Is that the crime? I know it's a crime in a lot

of countries in the world to be a Jew. Is it a crime here

now, especially in the light of what's going on?

CHIEF JUSTICE LEHMAN: Obviously, Mr. Meyer, our

job is to look at what the judge did below to see if there was - - to see if there was a mistake of law somehow that was committed during the course of the adoption. What do you think that the judge did wrong in his order in granting that adoption?

MR. MEYER: Well, sir, Your Honor, first I don't think there should have been an adoption. You, yourself wrote a stay on the adoption and I thank you greatly for what you said, sir. You're the first person that actually

mentioned euphemisms and innuendos as being what's done and not proving me as an unfit father.

I've asked three times for a trial to prove that I'm an unfit father first so I can at least have my say-so as to whether I was or not, or at least prove to me that I am unfit. But nobody wants to give me a jury trial. It's been denied, denied, denied.

I think they shouldn't have adopted the adoption first off. They should have taken my parental rights before having an adoption, adopt my daughter

away.

Then there is the matter of conflict of interest. First there was a conflict of interest with Judge Brackley. Ex parte hearings with Mr. Tate here, or should

PAGE 6

I say Magistrate Tate, there's another conflict of interest. Magistrate Tate here is a magistrate in the same court system and practicing law in the same court system, strictly against judicial canon.

Then there is a matter of David Drell's connection with Judge Park, the judge that heard the hearing.

And then I've also put in about - - and I do not say this lightly, Your Honor, because I've had a friend that in my life that was a Alabama Supreme Court justice and I know that he was a decent human being and a very kind person and was always treating me right, and I worked for him for a number of years. Reed Jones was his name.

So I don't take this lightly.

But I've even put in a pre-emptive disqualification on Justice Hill over his representing the

governor in a complaint against me over my calling the
governor's office numerous times, which I did, trying to
get the Department of Family Services to at least follow
the law, and was unable to. But I did call over and over
and Justice Hill as Attorney General represented the
governor on that matter and sent me letters, and I
consider that a conflict of interest.

And believe me, I'm not ungrateful, Justice Lehman, because what you said was really the first person

say anything decent about me, but your wife is the director of the Department of Family Services. I could never blame a man for doing what is best for his wife, and I think that would be a conflict of interest.

CHIEF JUSTICE LEHMAN: Well, and I guess that's what - - when you started bringing those things up I wanted to talk about that a little bit, but what we're really concerned about here is what the judge did, because that's what we are reviewing, is what that judge did below.

MR. MEYER: I guess the point I'm saying is, the hearing should never have taken place, Your Honor, because of all these conflicts of interest. If nothing else it should have taken place somewhere else, some other county, some other district judge.

I didn't complain against the Judge Kalokathis. I wrote to them and told them what I felt about the conflict of interest with Mr. Tate here, but other than that I think with all these conflicts of interest that that should have not been - - personally I think

the judge

should have recused himself and maybe referred it back to

Judge Kalokathis.

I don't think I got a fair hearing. Like I say, I was mentioning before, religion was mentioned in that

hearing. Mr. Clanton was shouting that my daughter should

be raised as a Christian, and this issue has been brought

up all along. I think that prejudices the whole situation.

They had nine and a half years to prove me as an

unfit father. What happened? Do they keep children forever and just say a lie about someone and say, well, they're unfit whether there's any proof or not? Nobody brought any proof or anything, or even brought charges for a trial.

CHIEF JUSTICE LEHMAN: It would appear to me from looking through the portion of this appeal that there was an effort of reunification and that was the primary effort that was identified for many years.

MR. MEYER: The effort was two hours a month.

CHIEF JUSTICE LEHMAN: Well, and the suggestion is that anytime there's an effort of reunification they develop some plans that people work through, and the allegation is that you refused to participate in any of those reunifications.

MR. MEYER: I beg to differ, Your Honor. I did everything that was asked for, except sign it, because I felt that to put my signature on it would be

tantamount, I

22 may be right or wrong, to signing away my parental rights

23 if for some reason I failed to answer those case plans.

24 But what was asked for in the case plan I did.

25 JUSTICE KITE: What about paying support for your

PAGE 14

1 But the evidence in this case is - - and it's

2 nothing to do with him being a Jew for gosh sake. The

3 only time I remember that being brought up was at an

4 earlier proceeding when he refused to give us his Social

Security number.

He was afraid to have to pay child support, because he said that somehow or another Jews were tattooed during World War II and he wouldn't give his Social Security number. The judge asked him and he wouldn't do it.

That's the only time I can remember that coming up. Mr. Clanton certainly didn't yell that this child shouldn't be raised as a Jew as he said. That's an absolute non-issue in this case.

The issue in this case is just the piles - - the

mountains of evidence that would demonstrate that he is not a fit person to have custody of this child and that he has absolutely refused to do the slightest little thing, even with the CASA workers, the volunteer workers that are trying to supervise the visitation.

He would show up filthy dirty, wreaking of body odor or whatever else he had been living in, to the point that his poor little daughter was just embarrassed to have to be around him at the YMCA, and he would

consciously try

25 to intimidate the CASA workers in this manner with this

PAGE 22

1 else can make a living here but I can't, not enough to

2 support a family and work on my retirement so I'll have

3 something to live on in my old age.

4 As far as - - I'm not going to get Social Security

5 because I don't use a Social Security number, not

6 because of tattoos as Mr. Tate said. I've never said

7 that. I avoid that question like the plague, just like I

avoid talking about prejudice against Jews like the plague, because it scares me to death.

My reason, if you'll look in your Bible, on the last story of Kings, King David went out and numbered the people clearly against the law of God and was warned by Joab, his chief of an Army, that that was wrong, and God punished him for that. And when the punishment ended it ended at Mount Mariah where the temple was built, and that's what happened, and that's why I don't use a Social

Security number.

I don't mind having a driver's license number because it doesn't bother me that people with a driver's license are numbered. I don't mind having a bank account number if I have a bank account because you want to keep your accounts straight. And I don't mind a military number being in the Army because people in the Army have to be numbered so that they know who's there.

JUSTICE GOLDEN: Military uses Social Security

EXHIBIT C

IN THE DISTRICT COURT
OF THE FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
WITHIN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SHERIDAN,
STATE OF WYOMING

State of Wyoming, Department of Family Services; and State of Wyoming Ex Rel Kelly JoAnne Drell, a minor child,

Petitioners,

vs.

Michael Meyer,

Respondent

Certified Copy
Civil Action No. C321-8-94
Posse No. 44095
Filed in the Office of the Clerk of the District Court of Sheridan County, WY
APR 15 1999
Clerk of Court
By Lela F. Chapman - Deputy

ORDER DISMISSING PETITION TO ESTABLISH SUPPORT FILED MARCH 8, 1999

THIS MATTER having come before the Court on the State's Motion Dismissing Petition to Establish Support filed March 8, 1999, and good cause appearing therefore;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Petition to Establish Support filed March 8, 1999, is hereby dismissed.

DATED this 15 day of April, 1999.

Original signed by John C. Brackley

Judge of the District Court

Copies to:

Eunice Drell

Michael Meyer

Colin Simpson, Attorney for Michael Meyer

Certificate of Clerk of the District Court. The above is a true and correct copy of the original instrument which is on file or record of this court.

Done this 15 day of April, 1999
Doris Kobold - Clerk
"s/Lela F. Chapman" - Deputy

IN THE DISTRICT COURT
OF THE FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
WITHIN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SHERIDAN,
STATE OF WYOMING

State of Wyoming, Department of Family Services; and State of Wyoming Ex Rel Kelly JoAnne Drell, a minor child, Petitioners, vs. Michael Meyer, Respondent	Civil Action No. C321-8-94 Posse No. 44095 Filed in the Office of the Clerk of the District Court of Sheridan County, WY APR 15, 1999 Clerk of Court by Lela F. Chapman Deputy

MOTION DISMISSING PETITION TO ESTABLISH SUPPORT FILED MARCH 8, 1999

COMES NOW the State of Wyoming by and through D. MICHAEL WILLIAMS, Attorney for Sate of Wyoming, Department of Family Services, and respectfully moves the Court for an Order Dismissing the Petition to Establish Support, filed March 8, 1999,

for the reason that the guardian of the minor child, Eunice Drell, has decided not to proceed with the collection of child support.

DATED this 13 day of April, 1999.

s/"D. Michael Williams"
D. Michael Williams
Attorney of State of Wyoming
224 South Main, Fourth Floor East
Sheridan, WY 82801
(307) 672-2599

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the above document was served upon the following by mailing same on the 15 day of April, 1999, by United States Mail, postage prepaid, addressed as follows:
Eunice Drell
Last Known Address

Michael Meyer
Hand Delivered

Colin Simpson
Attorney for Michael Meyer
P. O. Box 490
Cody, WY 82414

s/Lela F. Chapman
Deputy Clerk of Court

EXHIBIT D

IN THE SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WYOMING
April Term, A.D. 2000

IN THE INTEREST OF KD, a minor; MTM, Appellant (Respondent) v. STATE OF WYOMING, DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES, NATRONA COUNTY OFFICE Appellee (Petitioner)	No. C-00-4 IN THE SUPREME COURT STATE OF WYOMING FILED JUL - 5 2000 "s/Judy Pacheco", CLERK
IN THE MATTER OF THE ADOPTION OF KJD, minor child MTM, Petitioner	No. 00-161

ORDER STAYING ALL DISTRICT AND JUVENILE COURT PROCEEDINGS

These matters have come before the Court

upon the maturation of our Case No. C-00-4 (Natrona County Juvenile Court Action No. 6304-A) and the filing of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus by the child's natural and legal father, MTM, in our Case No. 00-161. Having reviewed the briefs and pleadings in Case No. C-00-4 and the petition and attachments thereto in Case No. 00-161, the Court makes the following findings:

1. An order made and entered by the district court for Sheridan County in that Court's Civil Action No. C321-8-94 on October 6, 1994, establishes paternity of the minor child, KD, in her natural father MTM, the appellant in Case No. C-00-4 and the petitioner in Case No. 00-161; Despite the availability of the

minor child's father, MTM, the district court for Sheridan County in that Court's Case No. P 129-9-95 made and entered an order appointing the minor child's maternal grandparents as her guardians and conservators on November 30, 1995, making only the following findings with respect to MTM: "[MTM's] lack of significant ties to the state of Wyoming, his employment record and limited income all cause the Court concern about his ability to provide a home for the minor child and manage significant financial assets;"

2. In the order which is the subject of

MTM's appeal in Case No. C-00-4, the juvenile court for Natrona County, in that court's Juvenile Action No. 6304-A, made only the following perfunctory findings with respect to the father, MTM:

"Further, it is not appropriate or in the best interest of the minor [KJD] to prevent removal from the minor's home nor is it appropriate for the minor to continue to reside in the minor's home, despite reasonable efforts to reunite the minor with the minor's family or make it possible for the minor to return to home.;"

3. References in the foregoing quoted order to "removal from the minor's

home" and "efforts to reunite the minor with the minor's family" are euphemisms which disguise the juvenile court's failure to find the minor child's father, MTM, unfit while refusing to grant the father custody of his daughter and simultaneously restricting opportunities for any contact with his daughter to 2 "supervised" hours per month;

4. Nothing has been presented to this Court by any of the parties to Case No. C-00-4, including, particularly the State of Wyoming and/or the Guardian ad Litem for the minor child, KD, which would demonstrate that any court in

Wyoming or any other state has ever judicially declared MTM to be unfit to have custody of the minor child, KD;

5. An order made and entered by the district court for Sheridan County in that county's Action No. A7-3-00 purports to set a petition for adoption of the minor child, KJD, by her maternal grandparents for the 12th day of July, 2000, beginning at 9:00 A.M.;

6. This Court should exercise its general supervisory authority to stay any and all proceedings in the district courts or juvenile courts of Sheridan County and Natrona County in derogation of the paternal rights of MTM with respect to

the minor child, KJD, pending resolution of MTM's petition for a writ of habeas corpus. It is therefore

ORDERED that any and all proceedings in the district or juvenile courts for Sheridan County with respect to the minor child, KJD, including particularly the adoption proceedings in the district court's Action No. A7-3-00, shall be, and the same hereby are stayed, pending further order of this Court; and it is, further,

ORDERED that any and all proceedings in the district or juvenile courts for Natrona County with respect to the minor child, KJD, including particularly Juvenile Court Action No. 6304-A, shall be, and the same hereby are stayed, pending further order of this Court; and

THIS ORDER NO PERSON OR PARTY SHALL VIOLATE UNDER PENALTY OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS IN THE SUPREME COURT OF WYOMING.

DATED this 5 day of June, 2000.

BY THE COURT:

"s/Larry L. Lehman"

Chief Justice

EXHIBIT E

Due to the printing needs of
THIS COURT
only relevant parts of this document are
printed here, but full pages of document
can be found in the original document
A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
presented to
THE TENTH FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE STATE OF WYOMING

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
SHERIDAN COUNTY COURTHOUSE
9:00 A.M. AUGUST 21, 2001
SHERIDAN, WYOMING

The Board of County Commissioners of Sheridan County, Wyoming, met at the time and place above-mentioned. Members present were Chairman B. Bradford Waters and Commissioner Charles L. Winton.

PUBLIC OFFICIAL BONDS

Having been approved as to form and legality by Matthew Redle, County Attorney, and upon a

unanimous vote, the Public Official Bonds for the following were approved and ordered filed with the County Treasurer.

Hardy H. Tate, Magistrate, 4th Judicial District Circuit Court - $1,000.

John G. Fenn, Magistrate, 4th Judicial District Circuit Court - $1,000.

Jay A. Gilbertz, Magistrate, 4th Judicial District Circuit Court - $1,000.

MEETING MINUTES

Upon a unanimous vote, the meeting minutes of August 6 and August 7, 2001 were approved as corrected.

OATH OF OFFICE

THE STATE OF WYOMING | ss.
COUNTY OF SHERIDAN |

I, Hardy H. Tate, having been appointed Magistrate for the County of Sheridan, State of Wyoming, do solemnly swear that I will support, obey and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of this State, and that I will discharge the duties of my office with fidelity; that I have not paid or contributed, or promised to pay or contribute, either directly or indirectly, any money or other valuable thing to procure my appointment, except for necessary and proper expenses expressly authorized by law; that I have not knowingly violated any election law of the State, or procured it to be done by others in my behalf; that I

will not knowingly receive, directly or indirectly, any money or other valuable thing for the performance or non-performance of any act or duty pertaining to my office, other than the compensation allowed by law.

"s/Hardy H. Tate"

Subscribed in my presence and sworn to before me this 13th Day of July, 2000.

"s/J. Samson"

(Authorized person to Administer Oath)

Due to the printing needs of
THIS COURT
only relevant parts of this document are printed here, but full pages of document can be found in the original document
A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
presented to
THE TENTH FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE STATE OF WYOMING

WYOMING JUDICIAL CANON 4

i. Anyone, whether or not a lawyer, who is an officer of a judicial system and who performs judicial functions, including an officer such as a magistrate, court commissioner, special master or referee, is a judge within the meaning of this Code. All judges shall comply with this Code except as provided below.

Commentary. ---- The four (4) categories of judicial service in other than a full-time capacity

are necessarily defined in general terms because of the widely varying forms of judicial service. For the purposes of this Section, as long as a retired judge is subject to recall the judge is considered to "perform judicial functions." The determination of which category and, accordingly, which specific Code provisions apply to an individual judicial officer, depend upon the facts of the particular judicial service.

C. Continuing Part-time Judge. – A continuing part-time judge

(1) is not required to comply

(a) except while serving as a judge, with Section 3B(9);

(b) at any time with Sections 4C(2), 4D(3), 4E(1), 4F, 4G, 4H, 5A(1), 5B(2) and 5D.

(2) except for a court commissioner, shall not practice law in the court on which the judge serves or in any court subject to appellate jurisdiction of the court on which the judge serves

(3) shall not act as a lawyer in a proceeding in which the judge has served as judge or in any other proceeding related thereto.

Commentary. ---- When a person who has been a continuing part-time judge is no longer a continuing part-time judge, that person may act as a lawyer in a proceeding in which he or she has served as a judge or in any other proceeding related thereto with the express consent of all parties pursuant to Rule 1.12(a) of the Wyoming Rules of Professional Conduct.

Orders & Motions

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF WYOMING

MICHAEL THEODORE MEYER, pro se Petitioner vs. EUNICE DRELL; LASHLEY DRELL; STATE OF WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES and THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF WYOMING Respondents.	Case No. 02 CV-0046-D Filed 15 MAR 2002 District of Wyoming Cheyenne

RE: A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT REQUEST

Now comes Michael Theodore Meyer pro se before the United States District Court for the District of Wyoming in the matter of the adoption of KD.

The following is stated in accordance with W. A. R. P. 2.05.

2. MICHAEL THEODORE MEYER is the Petitioner for A WRIT OF CERTIORARI.

3. The Judgment is A DECREE OF ADOPTION, In the Matter of the Adoption of KELLY JOANNE DRELL, a Minor Child, Adoption No. A7-3-00 entered February 14, 2001, in the FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, SHERIDAN COUNTY, WYOMING.

4. The Petition is to THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF WYOMING.

5. A transcript was made during the Adoption Hearing and is included in the document list.

THEREFORE, I submit this CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT REQUEST before THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT for the DISTRICT OF

WYOMING.

Dated: 15th day of March 2002

"s/Michael T. Meyer"

Michael Theodore Meyer, pro se
418 Meade Creek Road
Sheridan WY 82801

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF WYOMING

MICHAEL THEODORE MEYER, Pro Se

Petitioner

vs.

EUNICE DRELL, LASHLEY DRELL,
STATE OF WYOMING
DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY
SERVICES, and
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF
THE STATE OF WYOMING

Respondents

Case No.
02 CV-0046
-D.

FILED
15 MAR
2002
District of
Wyoming
Cheyenne

RE: A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
A DESIGNATION OF COURT DOCUMENTS

Now comes Michael Theodore Meyer pro se before the United States District Court for the District of Wyoming in the matter of the adoption of KD.

1. According to W. R. A. P. 3.05 and in the hope that there not be much that is repetitious, your Appellant desires that The Clerk of The Fourth

Judicial District, State of Wyoming, sent

to the Clerk of the United States District Court for

the District of Wyoming, the following

documents so listed, a sum total of 106

Instruments, Transcripts, and Exhibits.

In the Matter of the Adoption

of **Civil Action**

KELLY JOANNE DRELL **No. A7-3-00**

Minor Child

DATED: 15th day of April, 2002

Michael Theodore Meyer, pro se

Michael T. Meyer
418 Meade Creek Road
Sheridan, WY 82801

May 10, 2002

Honorable William S. Downes
Federal Judge
111 S. Wolcott; Room 121
Casper, WY 82601

RE: 02 CV 0046-D
A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI;
MEYER vs DRELL, et al - Sealed Filed Documents

To: HONORABLE WILLIAM S. DOWNES
FEDERAL JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF
WYOMING

Sir, I pray this letter finds you in good health. The content of this letter concerns the file mentioned in previous document (RE: A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI, A DESIGNATION OF COURT DOCUMENTS, dated 15 April 2002) which is at this time a sealed file, to my understanding. Also to my understanding is that you, Your Honor, might received this file through court order. It is my

personal belief that in order to understand the full ramifications of this PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI, one, anyone, would necessarily have to observe some documents of this file, if not all.

Many people, and agencies in Wyoming, and in other states, have portions or total copies of this file, namely - The Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming, and most assuredly its employees have access to this, of which many employees are involved; The Wyoming State Supreme Court has a complete copy; The Wyoming Attorney General's Office has a complete copy; Ross Clanton, Attorney At Law has a complete copy, as does Hardy Tate, Attorney At Law. Of course the Fourth Judicial District Court, State of Wyoming has a complete copy, as does the Seventh Judicial District Court, State

of Wyoming, since the same judge, David Park, presided in both courts in this matter. The 'Drells' have portions of this file, if not a complete file, including Kelly Drell - the minor child, and I feel also David Drell, her uncle, my brother-in-law, and former Natrona County Attorney, has copies of portions of this, and most assuredly access to the full file.

This is not to say that you, yourself, Your Honor, should have a copy of this file, just because everyone else on the block has a copy, including myself, but to say that the secrecy or sealing of the file in reality hides nothing from the parties concerned or the rest of the world, and therefore is moot as a consideration for not observing the file. I feel that in the interest of justice, that you, Your Honor, in

considering this matter and judging upon it, should have as much access to this file as I have, and these other people have, and that you, Your Honor, are less likely than anyone, to spill the beans and somehow make public the information contained therein.

To be brief, therefore, and in the interest of justice, and in making a knowledgeable decision that Your Honor issue the NECESSARY COURT ORDER, so that you also may have access to the extensive knowledge and information contained in these documents.

I thank you Sir for your time and considerations, and I pray for your well-being.

Sincerely,
"s/Michael Theodore Meyer"

cc: Betty A. Griess, Doree Kobold, Hoke MacMillan, Hardy H. Tate, Judy Pacheco, Ross Clanton, Department of Family Services

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF WYOMING

MICHAEL THEODORE MEYER

Petitioner

vs

EUNICE DRELL, LASHLEY DRELL, STATE OF WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES, AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF WYOMING,

Respondents.

Case No. 02 CV-0046 -D

ORDER DISMISSING ACTION

Mr. Meyer has filed a "Petition for a Writ of Certiorari" challenging a decision of the Wyoming Supreme Court affirming the final decree of adoption of the natural daughter. The Court finds that his petition should be dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

This is the second matter that Mr. Meyer has filed in the Court concerning the adoption of his

daughter. In his previous case, Mr. Meyer filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus to obtain custody of his daughter after a petition for adoption was filed by her maternal grandparents. On appeal of the denial of the habeas corpus petition, the Tenth Circuit found that the district court was without jurisdiction to entertain the petition. The appellate court also observed that even if the district court had construed Mr. Meyer's claims as arising under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the district court would lack jurisdiction over the claims. The appellate court explained:

> Petitioner alleges that the state-court decisions regarding the custody of K.D., supervised visitation, and petitioner's parental status, violate his constitutional rights. The same principals of comity that prevent us from entertaining petitioner's habeas petition also preclude review of the state-court decisions under the guise of a civil rights action. See Roman-Nose v. N.M. Dep't of Human Servs., 967 F.2d 434, 437 (10th Cir. 1992) (holding

federal action alleging constitutional infirmity in state parental-rights proceeding could not be maintained under § 1983); Anderson, 793 F.2d at 263-64 (holding district court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over § 1983 action challenging constitutionality of child-custody decision by state court, and that such issues should have been raised in state-court proceedings).

Federal courts, other that the United States Supreme Court, are without jurisdiction to adjudicate a claim which, in essence, seeks review of a state court judgement by claiming that the state decision violated the loser's federal rights. See D.C. Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462, 482, 486, 103, Ct. 1303, 75 L.Ed.2d 206 (1983) (holding federal review of state court judgments can only be obtained in the United States Supreme Court, even if the plaintiff challenges the constitutionality of the state court's action); Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co., 263 U.S. 413, 415-16, 44 S.Ct. 149, 68 L.Ed. 362 (1923) (same). Because petitioner simply seeks review of the state court decisions, there is no jurisdiction in this case.

Meyer v. Drell, 2001 WL 536881, at *2 (10th Cir. 2001).

Accordingly, this Court is without jurisdiction to entertain Mr. Meyer's current action challenging

the Wyoming Supreme Court's order affirming the final adoption decree.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE for lack of jurisdiction.

Dated this 10th day of May, 2002.

"s/William S. Downes"

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Filed District of Wyoming Casper 2002 May 10 PM 4:58 - U. S. District Court.

Entered on the docket 13 May 02 (Date) Betty A. Griess, Clerk by "signature illegible: deputy clerk.

IN THE UNITED STATES
FEDERAL COURT OF APPEALS
TENTH CIRCUIT FOR THE DISTRICT
OF WYOMING

MICHAEL THEODORE MEYER, pro se
Petitioner,
vs.

EUNICE DRELL, LASHLEY DRELL,
STATE OF WYOMING
DEPARTMENT
OF FAMILY SERVICES
and
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF
THE STATE OF WYOMING
Respondents.

Case No.
02 CV-
0046-D
Filed:
07 JUN 02

District of
Wyoming
Cheyenne

A NOTICE OF APPEAL CONCERNING
A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
A DESIGNATION OF COURT DOCUMENTS

Now comes Michael Theodore Meyer pro se, with a NOTICE OF APPEAL CONCERNING A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI, pursuant to U. S. C. S. Title 28 § 2253.

1. The above captioned matter is an appealable

action.

2. Judge Downes has denied action, by his court, in the above captioned matter, due to lack of jurisdiction. I believe this to be true, that these Federal District courts have no latitude concerning state welfare agencies. It is my fervent hope that perhaps this action, and many others which are on the table, will change the situation. My reason being, that these welfare agencies are primarily federally funded for the lions share, and therefore should be more tightly controlled at the judicial end, where problems and conflicts show up most documented and most able to be resolved, much more so than on the initial entry, regulatory end at the federal level. One

need only look out upon the landscape of American culture to see the detriment and corruption created by this adventure into Marxism, this Great Society. When one looks out one's window, one sees a land with a single parent child that is 75% the norm, the two-parent child is the minority. This tends to raise 75% of America's children impoverished by life without a father figure. My personal belief is that this eventually ends up as the reason that our streets are not safe, our schools are not safe; we cannot leave our homes, or stay in our homes, without all the doors and windows locked. This is the legacy of all Marxist experiments.

WHEREFORE I RESPECTFULLY SUBMIT this

NOTICE OF APPEAL CONCERNING A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI, before THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, TENTH CIRCUIT FOR THE DISTRICT OF WYOMING, in the SINCERE HOPE of finding JUSTICE AND RELIEF for my daughter and Myself after these ten (10) long years.

Dated 6th day of June 2002 "s/Michael Meyer"

Michael Theodore Meyey, pro se

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

MICHAEL THEODORE MEYER

Appellant,

vs.

EUNICE DRELL; LASHLEY DRELL; WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF WYOMING.

Appellee.

Case No. 02-8049

BRIEF OF THE APPELLANT NOW comes MICHAEL THEODORE MEYER, PRO SE before THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT with this BRIEF OF THE APPELLANT.

1. On June 21, 2002, Lashley Drell, so named in the caption above, died. Sadly, he had succumbed to the complications of advanced age

and years of poor health. His years of poor health, and the fact that he had been living in a nursing home, that Eunice Drell is of no blood tie or relation to the child K. D. but merely Lashley Drell's third wife, was discussed at length during the adoption hearing itself, in the Fourth Judicial District Court, State of Wyoming (Judge David Park, presiding - see Designation of Court Documents: 05/08/01 Transcript of Trial Proceedings 1/22/01, pages 157, 158. These are a sealed file - see personal letter from Michael T. Meyer to Honorable William S. Downes, Federal Judge, Casper, Wyoming, dated May 10, 2002, Proceeding No. 6 - 05/13/02) and also mentioned in oral argument before the Wyoming State Supreme Court, October 18, 2001, and was discussed on page 4 of the transcript of that hearing

(See Certification of Transcript in Petition of Certiorari, Proceeding No. 2, Entry date 04/17/02). These are covered under Wyoming Law W. S. 14-2-101 through 14-2-114. Several times, the health of the adopting parents and the health of the non-consenting parent is discussed and mandated to be taken into consideration, at length. Mr. Meyer feels that these were avoided, overlooked, made non-applicable, because of the close relationship of Judge Parks to the Drell family, i.e. David Drell, because of the influence of Magistrate Hardy H. Tate serving as an attorney for the Drells, in the same courtroom that he serves as a magistrate in, and paid for by the Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming, and also later, in appeal to the Wyoming State Supreme Court, due to the fact that the wife of Chief

Justice Larry Lehman, Susan Lehman, was Director of the Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming at that time, and I understand still is.

2. Neither Mr. Meyer, nor his daughter, have been charged, tried or convicted of any crime that would warrant this separation. No trial was ever made, although Mr. Meyer had requested a jury trial three times concerning his parental rights. This has been discussed at length in A Petition for A Writ of Habeas Corpus (See Designation of Court Documents: In Sealed File, Fourth Judicial District, State of Wyoming, 06/29/00 A Petition For A Writ of Habeas Corpus, which was eventually reviewed by the United States Court of Appeals Tenth Circuit in May, 2001 and judged by Justices Ebel, Porfilio, and Lucero, Circuit Judges, for your court - Order and

Judgement date 05/21/01 No. 00-8058, D.C. No. 00-CV-136J). Mr. Meyer feels that this error of law, namely this denial of jury trial, thus denial of justice true and correct, was done for the same stated conflicts of interest in the above No. 1. Mr. Meyer wants to see the applications of Wyoming Laws W. S. 14-2-101 through 14-2-114 to be applied correctly and lawfully through jury trial concerning his parental rights. If no evidence is found to warrant a trial then Mr. Meyer wants his daughter back - lock, stock and barrel. Mr. Meyer desires that the aforementioned 'conflicts of interests' be addressed concerning Judge Parks, Chief Justice Lehman and Magistrate Hardy H. Tate, i.e. Judge Parks' friendship with David Drell, constituting abuse in this case; Chief Justice Larry Lehman's wife being Director of Family Services,

creating abuse in any DFS oriented appeal to the Wyoming State Supreme Court, and of course Magistrate Hardy H. Tate's representing clients, as an attorney, in the very same court rooms in which he's a magistrate, constituting an abuse towards his own clients and of course abuse towards his opponent's clients, as there can never be found any sense of justice in such a situation. Mr. Meyer would also like the Court to apply 28 U. S. C. S. 2241 n40, n165, n166, n170, n207; Apply 28 U. S. C. S. 2243 n2, n6, n7, n10, n14, n21, n23, n48, n50, n57; Apply 28 U. S. C. S. 2254 n33.

3. There is no need for oral argument in this matter, in Mr. Meyer's opinion, but he is available for oral argument at any time at the convenience of the Justices, but he feels the

documentation amply speaks for itself.

My thanks and gratitude to the United States Court of Appeals Tenth Circuit, for their time and efforts.

Dated this 17th day of July, 2002.

"s/Michael T. Meyer"

MICHAEL THEODORE MEYER PRO SE
418 Meade Creek Road
Sheridan, WY 82801

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

MICHAEL THEODORE MEYER Appellant, vs. EUNICE DRELL; LASHLEY DRELL; WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF WYOMING	Case No. 02-8049

A MOTION FOR DISCLOSURE

NOW comes MICHAEL THEODORE MEYER, PRO SE before THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT with A MOTION FOR DISCLOSURE.

1. Michael Theodore Meyer is a party to the action.

2. Pursuant to W. S. 1-22-104 (d), 14-3-214 (b), (i), and W.S. 1-22-104 (d), that any

and all documentation now and in the future, in possession of The Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming, through their representation, The Attorney General's Office, State of Wyoming, concerning the above captioned matter, that copies thereof be made available to Michael Theodore Meyer, Pro Se, in accordance to W. S. 1-22-104 (d), and that all costs, fees and expenses incurred, to make these available to Michael Theodore Meyer, Pro Se, in this above captioned matter, be upon their head, i.e., Wyoming Department of Family Services, State of Wyoming.

Wherefore we submit this MOTION FOR DISCLOSURE and that these copies of documentation be sent to Michael Theodore Meyer,

Pro Se, 418 Meade Creek Road, Sheridan, Wyoming,

82801.

Dated this 3rd day of September, 2002.

"s/Michael T. Meyer"

MICHAEL THEODORE MEYER PRO SE
418 Meade Creek Road
Sheridan, WY 82801

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
TENTH CIRCUIT

MICHAEL THEODORE MEYER

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

EUNICE DRELL; LASHLEY DRELL; WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES; and WYOMING ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 02-8049
D.C. No.
02-CV-46-D
(D. Wyoming)

FILED
United States Court
Of Appeals Tenth
Circuit DEC 11 2002
PATRICK FISHER
Clerk

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before KELLY, McKAY and MURPHY, Circuit Judges.

After examining the briefs of the appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously to honor parties' request for a decision on the briefs without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34 (f); 10th Cir. R. 34.1 (G). The case is therefore submitted

without oral argument.

*This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. The court generally disfavors the citation of orders and judgments; nevertheless, an order and judgment may be cited under the terms and conditions of 10th Cir. R. 36.3.

Petitioner Michael Theodore Meyer appeals the district court's dismissal of his "Petition for a Writ of Certiorari." As petitioner is proceeding pro se, we construe his claims liberally. See Drake v. City of Fort Collins, 927 F.2d 1156, 1159 (10th Cir. 1991). Since a petition for writ of certiorari is improper in the court of appeals, Petitioner's arguments clearly

indicate that he is requesting habeas corpus relief.

This is the second action filed by Petitioner concerning the adoption of his natural daughter, K.D., that has reached this court of appeal. In his previous case, we held that the district court lacked jurisdiction to consider the matter. We noted that

> Petitioner alleges that the state-court decisions regarding the custody of K.D., supervised visitation, and petitioner's parental status, violate his constitutional rights. The same principles of comity that prevent us from entertaining petitioner's habeas petition also preclude review of the state-court decisions under the guise of a civil rights action.

Meyer v. Drell, 2001 WL 536881, at *2 (10th Cir. 2001) (unpublished); see also Roman-Nose v. N.M. Dep't of Human Servs., 967 F.2d 435, 437 (10th Cir. 1992). The only federal court with jurisdiction to review a state court judgment for potential violations of federal rights is the United States Supreme Court. See D.C.

Ct. of App. V. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462, 476, 482, 486 (1983); Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co., 263 U.S. 413, 415-16 (1923).

Because Petitioner challenges a final decree of the Wyoming Supreme Court affirming the final decree of the adoption of his daughter, we agree with the district court that it lacked jurisdiction to consider the case. The appropriate method for seeking relief from the Wyoming Supreme Court's decision is to file a petition for writ of certiorari with the United States Supreme Court.

AFFIRMED

Entered for the Court

Monroe G. McKay
Circuit Judge

APPENDIX

CIVIL APPEARANCE DOCKET
No. A7-3-00; Docket No. 236
FILED 3/21/00

PARTIES

IN THE MATTER OF THE ADOPTION OF:
KELLY JOANNE DRELL, A Minor Child
vs.

ATTORNEYS:
For Plaintiff - Hardy Tate; for First Interstate Bank, John Botten, Atty.

ACTION: Adoption

DATE	DOCKET ENTRIES
3/21/00	Petition for Adoption 3cc: Tate, Drell, Meyer; Consent to Adoption signed by Carolyn Yeaman, Guardian of minor child; Affidavit Pursuant to 1-22-104 (c) (iv) - of Petitioners. Costs Paid: $25.00 filing fee.

3/28/00	Demand for Jury Trial (filed by Michael Meyer). Costs Paid: $50.00 Jury; Motion to Set Jury Trial Date. Costs Paid: $45.00 Law Library.
3/30/00	Response by Clerk to Jury Demand
3/30/00	Motion to Dismiss a Petition to Adopt; 4c: Meyer
3/30/00	Precipe for Subpoena; Subpoenas issued (4).
3/30/00	Affidavit of Service - Michael Meyer served personally
3/31/00	Motion to Dismiss a Petition to Adopt, 4c: Michael Meyer
4/3/00	Request for Appointment of Guardian ad Litem
4/3/00	Motion to dismiss A Petition to Adopt;

	4c: Michael Meyer
4/4/00	Objection to Motion to Appoint Ross Clanton as Guardian ad Litem; 4c: Meyer
4/6/00	Objection to Subpoenas Served Upon First Interstate Bank on Behalf of Michael Theodore Meyer; c: J. Botten for Bank
4/7/00	Motion to Dismiss a Petition to Adopt; 4c: M. Meyer
4/11/00	Order Setting Hearing 5/4/00 @ 2:30 PM; c: Tate in Box; mailed to Mike Meyer, Ross Clanton.
4/14/00	Motion for Setting (To Include Med Report) 4c: Meyer; Motion to Remove and Replace Northern Wyoming Mental

Health Center, Inc. as Psychological Caregiver, 4c: Mike Meyer.

4/14/00 Order Setting Hearing 5/4/00 @ 2:30 PM, c: Tate in box; mailed: M. Meyer, Dan Wilde, Ross Clanton

5/1/00 Sheriff's Return First Interstate Bank served 4/3/00.

CIVIL APPEARANCE DOCKET
No. A7-3-00; Docket No. 236
FILED 3/21/00

PARTIES

IN THE MATTER OF THE ADOPTION OF:
KELLY JOANNE DRELL, A Minor Child
vs.

ATTORNEYS:
For Plaintiff - Hardy Tate; for First Interstate Bank, John Botten, Atty.

ACTION: Adoption

DATE DOCKET ENTRIES

5/1/00 A Motion to Suppress Motion to Quash

	Subpoenas Duces Tecum
5/1/00	Order Setting Hearing on both motions filed 5/1/00; Hearing: 5/17/00 @ 3:30 PM, c: Botten, Tate in box; mailed to Michael Meyer, Dan Wilde, Ross Clanton.
5/4/00	Certified copy of Motion for Guardian ad Litem/Order Appointing Guardian ad Litem (from Natrona County)
5/8/00	Response of Guardian ad Litem to Michael Meyer's Motions to Dismiss, c: Clanton.
5/8/00	A Motion to Examine and Compare Court Ordered Medical Report with Evidence Presented in a Motion to Include a Medical Report Filed April 6,

2000.

5/8/00 Motion for Setting (on above Motion to Examine and Compare...)

5/9/00 Letter to Judge Brackley from Hardy Tate re: 3 orders directed by Judge to prepare Copy of letter addressed to Michael Meyer from Hardy Tate re: copies of the three orders Hardy was directed to prepare.

5/9/00 Order Setting Hearing (Motion to Examine and Compare Court Ordered Med Reports) May 17, 2000 @ 3:30 PM, c: Tate in box; mailed to M. Meyer, R. Clanton, Dan Wilde.

5/9/00 Precipe for Subpoena - Subpoenas issued (6) - William Tyrrell, Pam

Christensen, Kim Larsen, Juli Wallen, Trish Warren, Mary Bowers, MD

5/9/00 Precipe for Subpoena - Subpoenas issued DFS (4), Salomon Smith Barney (1), Mary Bowers, MD (1), NWMHC (4).

5/9/00 A Motion to Dismss, 4c: M. Meyer

5/9/00 Motion for Setting (Hearing on Motion to Dismiss), 4c: Michael Meyer.

5/10/00 Order Setting Hearing (Motion to Dismiss) 5/17/00 @ 3:30 PM, c: Tate in box; mailed to M. Meyer, Ross Clanton, Dan Wilde.

5/11/00 Minute Order AJ6-186 Dr. Mary Bowers to prepare report regarding present med condition of minor and submit to court through Hardy Tate, cc: Tate, Ross

	Clanton, Mike Meyer, Lashley & Eunice Drell.
5/11/00	Order Regarding Further Hearings AJ6-187–188 All before 5/15/00 @ 2:30 PM; all previously filed motions shall be heard 5/17/00 @ 3:30 PM, cc: Tate, Mike Meyer, Ross Clanton, Lashley Drell.
5/11/00	Order Appointing Guardian Ad Litem AJ6-189-192; Ross Clanton appt as GAL, cc: Tate, Meyer, Drell's, Clanton.
5/11/00	Objection to Ten Day Limitation on Filing Motions, 4c: Meyer
5/16/00	Document Delivery - Subpoenas Duces Tecum and Subpoena to Appear - Mary Bowers, MD - served 5/10/00; Document Deliver - (4) Subpoenas

Duces Tecum and (1) Subpoena to Appear - NWMHC - served 5/10/00 (Pam Christensen); Document Delivery - (3) Subpoenas Duces Tecum - Salomon Smith Barney - served personally 5/11/00; Document Delivery - (4) Subpoena Duces Tecum and (3) Subpoena to Appear (Trish Warren, Kim Larsen, William Tyrrell) - served 5/10/00; Subpoena for Juli Wallen not served as unable to find her.

5/19/00 Order for Setting 7/12/00 @ 9:00 am, c: Tate in box; mailed to Ross Clanton, Michael Meyer.

5/25/00 Medical report from Mary Bowers, MD

5/31/00 Objection to Order Dismissing Motions

to dismiss a Petition to Adopt.

6/1/00 Order on Motions and objections related to subpoenas served upon First Interstate Bank on Behalf of Michael Meyer AJ6-196 Copy mailed to Meyer and Botten in Box.

6/1/00 Order Requiring Production of Bank Statements AJ6-197-198 CC to Meyer, Clanton, Tate and Drell by Clerk.

6/2/00 Order Dismissing Motions AJ6-199 CC to: Clanton, Tate, Drell, Meyer, Kirven; Drell's given to Tate.

6/2/00 Letter to Judge Brackley from Ross Clanton re: letter written to M. Meyer giving him 10 days to file answer or face default.

6/8/00	Letter to Judge Brackley from Ross Clanton with copy of Order Denying Motion to Dismiss Appeal (Sup Ct)
6/29/00	A Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus
6/30/00	Order Denying Writ of Habeas Corpus AJ6-205; cc: Tate in box; mailed to M. Meyer, Ross Clanton.
7/3/00	Letter to Judge Brackley from Michael Meyer re: Order Requiring Production of Bank Statements
7/7/00	Copy of Letter addressed to Judy Pacheco of Sup Ct (Notice that 7/12/00 trial is vacated). Copies sent to parties by L. Leupold.

CIVIL APPEARANCE DOCKET
No. A7-3-00; Docket No. 236
FILED 3/21/00

PARTIES

IN THE MATTER OF THE ADOPTION OF:
KELLY JOANNE DRELL, A Minor Child
vs.

ATTORNEYS:
For Plaintiff - Hardy Tate

Hon Nicholas Kalokathis
309 W. 20th St., Suite 3348
Cheyenne, WY 82001

ACTION: Adoption

DATE	DOCKET ENTRIES
7/13/00	Letter addressed to Judge Brackley from Judy Pacheco of Sup. Ct. re: Justices to decide on petition of writ of Habeas Corpus at next conference.
7/19/00	Fax copy of Order Denying Writ and Lifting Stay.
7/21/00	Order Denying Writ and Lifting Stay.
7/31/00	Order of Assignment AJ6-224; cc: Tate in box; mailed to M. Meyer, Ross

Clanton, Judge Kalokathis w/copy of file.

8/16/00 Copy of Guardian ad Litem's Response to Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus with letter from Ross Clanton.

8/18/00 Letter to Judge Brackley from Ross Clanton re: resetting of trial date; Copy of Order Assigning Case to Expedite Docket; Request for Setting

8/21/00 Request for Setting/Notice of Setting 10/24/00 @ 9:00 am c: Tate, Ross Clanton, Dan Wilde, Mike Meyer, Judge Kalokathis.

8/29/00 Copy of Letter addressed to Mike Meyer from US Court of Appeals in the Tenth Circuit re: appeal with

attachments; Notice of Appeal Concerning A Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus, Pro Se Docketing Statement and Order Denying Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus.

9/6/00 Copy of letter addressed to Mike Meyer from Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals - Court has docketed appeal C: Kalokathis.

9/6/00 Copy of letter addressed to Judge Kalokathis from Mike Meyer re: Order Requiring Prod of Bank Statement and Order Regarding Further Hearings. C: Kalokathis.

10/6/00 Letter from Judge Kalokathis addressed to parties involved re: unable to act on

Meyer's request.

10/20/00 Order Vacating Trial (10/24/00 trial vacated) AJ6-231 cc: Tate in box; mailed to D. Wilde, R. Clanton, Mike Meyer, Judge Kalokathis.

10/23/00 Copy of letter written by Mike Meyer to Judge Kalokathis regarding Hardy Tate's appointment as Magistrate.

10/23/00 Order Re-Assigning Case AJ6-236 (back to J. Brackley) cc: Tate, Wilde, Clanton, Meyer.

10/30/00 Order of Assignment AJ6-237-238 (Assigned to Dan Spangler) cc: Tate, Clanton, Meyer, Wilde, Judge Spangler.

11/9/00 A Motion of Preemptory Disqualification Upon Judge Dan

Spangler.

11/20/00 Order of Assignment AJ6-247 Hon David B. Park to preside; cc: Park, Clanton, Meyer mailed; Tate in box.

11/29/00 Return receipt filed (sent copy of case to Judge Park).

12/1/00 Request for Setting/Notice of Setting 1/22/01 @ 1:30 PM

1/4/01 Correspondence from Judge Park's office w/copy of letter sent to Michael Meyer re: hearing location.

1/8/01 Letter from Judge Park's office with copy of Mike Meyer's correspondence addressed to him re: Hardy Tate.

1/10/01 Copy of letter written by Judge Park to Michael Meyer re: Hardy Tate's

representation of DFS.

1/12/01 Precipe for Subpoena, subpoena issued (2) Allison Morrison, Michael Smith

1/21/01 Precipe for Subpoena, Subpoena issued (3) Pam Christiansen, Pam Emerson, Tara Kwolek.

1/23/01 Subpoenas filed (3) - Pam Christianson, Pam Emerson and Tara Kwolek served pers on 1/12/01.

1/25/01 Subpoena filed - Michael Smith served per.

1/29/01 Excerpt of Transcript of Trial Proceeding.

2/14/01 Final Decree of Adoption AJ6-260-262; cc: Tate, Mike Meyer, Drell's, Ross Clanton, Judge Park.

2/14/01	Letter addressed to Judge Park from Mike Meyer.
3/9/01	Letter addressed to Ross Clanton/Casper from Atty. Hardy Tate dated 1/29/01, re: Final Decree of Adopt; letter addressed to Atty. Tate from Hon. David B. Park dated 2/13/01, re: Sign and forward Final Decree; A Notice of Appeal/by Michael Theodore Meyer; 12 c: Meyer-pers. (Pd. $60 filing fee; holding $85 for Supreme Court.
3/16/01	Copy of letter addressed to Michael Meyer from Bobbette Jasmann re: copy of transcript from hearing held 1/22/01.
3/26/01	Certification of Transcript Request; 14c:

	Meyer.
5/8/01	Official Court Reporter's Certificate of Completion Transcript of Trial Proceedings (1/22/01).
5/10/01	Letter to Supreme Court Re: Record complete (three (3) vols. Sent $85.00 filing fee and copy of Index c: M. Meyer-mld, Tate-box (with copy of Index of Record).
5/21/01	Letter from Supreme Court dated 5/17/01, Re: Appeal docketed; receipt enclosed for $85; Appellant Brief due in 45 days.
6/25/01	Brief of the Appellant/filed by Michael Theodore Meyer w/no Designation.
7/2/01	An Addition to the Brief of the

Appellant/by M. Meyer/A Designation of Court Documents/by M. Meyer.

8/1/01 Appellee's Designation of Record/by Tate.

8/22/01 Letter from Supreme Court dated 8/20/01, Re: Request to send Record on Appeal.

8/24/01 Letter to Supreme Court sending Record On Appeal (five (5) volumes) c: Atty. Tate, M. Meyer-mld Certificate of Record.

8/28/01 Certified Mail Receipt/filed from SC

8/29/01 Letter from Supreme Court, dated 8/27/01, Re: Record On Appeal filed 8/27/01.

2/19/02 Supreme Court Opinion

3/5/02	Mandate Affirming Judgment from Supreme Court c: M. Meyer-mld Atty. Tate-box.
3/6/02	Letter from Supreme Court dated 3/4/02, re: Mandate issued; appeal (5 volumes) being returned today.
8/8/02	Fax copy of letter addressed to CDC from Sue Charfield, Asst AG re: Motion for Release of Confidential Files.
8/8/02	Fax copy of Motion for Release of Confidential Files.
8/9/02	Original letter from S. Chatfield re: Motion
8/9/02	Motion for Release of Confidential Files c: Chatfield.
8/9/02	Fax copy of Order Granting Release of

Confidential Files.

8/13/02 Order Granting Release of Confidential Files AJ6-334 cc: Tate in box; mailed to Sue Shatfield, Michael Meyer.

8/14/02 Return Receipt filed show Sue Chatfield received adoption files.